

## David King

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 25, 2022 8:49 AM  
**To:** [wewill@cityofchicago.org](mailto:wewill@cityofchicago.org)  
**Subject:** Comment on We Will Chicago efforts

[Warning: External email]

I found it hard to open some of the pdf documents on the website. I do not have similar problems opening pdf files on other websites.

In general, I found the plan incredibly depressing and disappointing. So much of the justification for the goals and objectives was inadequate or entirely lacking. Citing national statistics was not helpful. Some of the survey questions did not accurately represent the portion of the plan about which they were asking questions. Instead of asking questions that would elicit meaningful responses, the questions were often phrased in a way that steered the participant in one particular direction. Due to that kind of dishonest survey structure, the results of the survey cannot be fairly said to support the elements of the plan.

Actual and perceived social and economic inequities are not a good starting point for developing what should have been a comprehensive plan to provide Chicago with a path forward. I found the acknowledgement of systemic inequities especially flawed and irrelevant. It was not necessary, and it did nothing to advance the plan. At best, it cited a few factors that contributed to the situation we find ourselves in today. However, by selectively citing a limited variety of factors it fails to adequately capture most or many of the reasons Chicago is the way it is today.

The information on the web site indicates that equity and resiliency were fundamental guiding principles. I found that while the plan did define equity and resiliency, many of the goals and objectives of the plan did not adhere to those definitions.

For example, the plan defines equity as: Equity is both an outcome and a process that results in fair and just access to opportunity and resources that provide everyone the ability to thrive. However, in many places in the plan it is made very clear that objective is not to provide fair and just access to opportunity and resources to everyone. Instead, the plan often focuses on limiting its efforts to select communities and people based on color rather than income or need. Such a foundation is racist to the core and not fair or just.

And in some areas, the goals and objectives seem to seek to punish certain people or activities while unjustly favoring others. That is especially the case in the transportation area where bike riders and walkers are greatly favored over the many people who must use gasoline powered vehicles. No consideration is given to those who must drive. Instead, those who bike or walk are automatically assumed to be a higher priority than drivers. That is not fair or equitable.

A huge flaw in the plan is the lack of any focus on asking the hard questions about whether or not the public investment in achieving the goals and objectives is fiscally responsible or will have any real chance of achieving the desired results. The plan often fails to define success for each goal and objective. When do the efforts under the plan end? When does the plan get reexamined to verify that the steps being taken are actually working? What does success look like for each goal and objective and how will the efforts to achieve each goal and objective be measure and evaluated?

Possibly the biggest flaw in the plan is the total failure to place some responsibility on individuals for taking steps to help the goals and objectives be achieved. There is way too much focus on government providing all the solutions, answers, funding and results. If such plans are to succeed individuals must have some ownership and responsibility for taking part in the effort and doing their part.

Another major flaw in the plan is its total failure to take into account the significant changes in the way people work and the impacts of Covid. The plan also ignores declining mass transit usage and the ongoing decline in population in some communities. Another major flaw is the failure to recognize that the housing stock in Chicago is aging across the entire

city and a huge investment is needed to update, upgrade and improve that housing stock. Instead, the plan focuses too heavily on affordable housing without explaining who bears the ongoing costs to keep housing affordable.